

2 pamph
So



Pamph.
Social
C.

S P E E C H

BY

ANDREW CARNEGIE, LL.D.,

III

AT THE

Annual Meeting of the Peace Society,

IN THE

GUILDHALL, LONDON, E.C.

MAY 24TH, 1910.



THE PEACE SOCIETY,

47, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

1910.

Pamph
Social

C. SPEECH

BY

ANDREW CARNEGIE, LL.D.,

AT THE

Annual Meeting of the Peace Society,

IN THE

GUILDHALL, LONDON, E.C.

MAY 24TH, 1910.

THE PEACE SOCIETY,

47, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

—
1910.

SPEECH

ANDREW CARNegie, LL.D.

Annual Meeting of the Peace Society



THE PEACE SOCIETY

42, NEW BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

SPEECH

BY

ANDREW CARNEGIE, LL.D.



ESTEEM it a privilege to address you in this memorable Guildhall. Let my first words be those of tribute to the great Peacemaker we have just lost.

We of the English-speaking race from across the Atlantic mingle our tears with yours, for King Edward, in his youth, captivated the American people.

Fortunately, there is every ground for belief that his successor will tread in his father's footsteps, and thus draw closer and closer together the two branches of our race.

Long and earnestly have the teachers of men sought relief from war, which has drawn from the most illustrious such fierce denunciations as no other crime has evoked—perhaps not all the other national crimes combined. Surely no civilised community in our day can resist the conclusion

SPEECH BY

that the killing of man by man, as a means of settling international disputes is the foulest blot upon human society, the greatest curse of human life, and that as long as men continue thus to kill one another they have slight claim to rank as civilised, since in this respect they remain savages. The crime of war is inherent, it awards victory not to the nation that is right, but to that which is strong. It knows nothing of righteous judgment.

In man's triumphant upward march he has outgrown many savage habits : he no longer eats his fellows, or buys and sells them, or sacrifices prisoners of war, or puts vanquished garrisons to the sword, or confiscates private property, or bombards unfortified ports, poisons wells, or sacks cities. No more—

. . . “ the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard at heart,
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell.”

All these changes in the rules of war have been made from time to time, just as our race rose from the savage state towards civilisation. They are chiefly the good fruits of the last century, for even Wellington sacked cities.

If all civilised people now regard these former atrocities of war as disgraceful to humanity, how

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

soon must their successors regard the root of these barbarities, war itself, as unworthy of civilised men, and discard it as intolerable?

We are marching fast to that day, through the reign of law, under which civilised people are now compelled to live. No citizen of a civilised nation is permitted to-day to wage war against his fellow citizen or to redress his own wrongs, real or fancied. Even if assaulted he can legally use force only sufficient to protect himself; then the law steps in, and administers punishment to the aggressor based upon evidence. Hence, if a citizen attempts to sit as judge in his own cause or to redress his wrongs in case of dispute with another, he becomes a lawbreaker. Now, nations being only aggregations of individuals, why should they be permitted to wage war against other nations, when, if all were classed as citizens of one nation, they would be denied this right of war, and would have to subject themselves to the reign of law? Not long can this continue to commend itself to the judgment of intelligent men. Consider our own Republic, with an area little smaller than that of Europe, within whose wide borders war is impossible, every citizen being honourably bound to keep the peace and submit to the courts of law, which alone

SPEECH BY

administer judgment in cases of dispute, and contrast it with Europe, an armed camp—armed not against distant foreign enemies upon other continents, but against itself. Under present rules of war, there are in Europe as many possible centres of war as there are nations. We have forty-six nations in America, called States, yet there is not one centre of war. Resort to force would be rebellion. This unity, which ensures freedom from danger of internal war and free exchange of products, is fast leading our Union to the front.

In considering the problem of war, let it be noted that it is no longer actual war itself which the world in our day has most to dread. This is not the greatest curse. It is the ever present danger of war, which hangs over the world like a pall, which we have to dispel. Men are now born and die, their country's Peace unbroken, but in scarcely a year of their lives is it not endangered, and not a day can pass which is not disturbed by the fearful note of "preparation for war" throughout the world, which some writers still venture to recommend even in editorial columns as the best preventative of war.

On the contrary, preparation by one nation compels rival preparation by others, each honestly

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

protesting that only protection, and not attack, is desired, the inevitable result being, however, that mutual suspicion is aroused, and as each vies with the other in fearful preparation, national hatreds develop, and then only a spark is needed to kindle the torch of war.

Partial disarmament cannot remove this danger of war ; it would only give quarrelling neighbours two pistols instead of three, war continuing as probable as ever.

It is not what bearings a question at issue between nations may have upon the countries of the respective disputants which is of first importance in determining the result of Peace or war ; it is in what spirit, friendly or unfriendly, negotiations are entered upon. Disputes that would be easily settled between friendly nations become the basis of war when international jealousies exist. An illustration of this vital truth is the incident upon the Dogger Bank, which recently excited Great Britain and Russia. It was promptly settled, but if the parties had been Great Britain and Germany it would in all probability have led to war, so readily does rival preparation provide the inflammable material upon which war feeds.

The insuperable objection to "preparation" is that it inevitably leads to the building of com-

SPEECH BY

peting armaments by Powers which otherwise would not have increased them, thus spreading the area of war, and making more nations possible enemies. Hence the most prolific mother of war in our day is "preparation," as "territorial aggrandisement" has been until recently.

There is one important feature of our time which has to be most carefully considered—every ruler, statesman, and ambassador of every country repeatedly protests that their armaments are for protection only: that their country seeks not territorial additions · that its first and last desire is Peace as the greatest blessing. In all this they are beyond question sincere, all really desire Peace, and their armaments are intended to be protective instruments only. Why, then, is Peace not secured? The answer is that the leaders of nations at their respective capitals are strangers to each other, and communicate only through their ambassadors; they do not trust each other; each suspects sinister designs in the other, and, fearful of offending public opinion, so easily excited upon international issues, they hesitate to adopt broad Peace measures of common justice, or to agree to arbitration which might decide against their country. Under present world-conditions, if the makers of treaties knew

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

and trusted each other war would soon become obsolete, for it is an indubitable fact that the reign of Peace would be most advantageous for all nations. To every nation war would be a calamity. Let us rid ourselves of thinking that there are good nations who abhor war, and bad nations who lie in wait for an opportunity to attack the weak. In our day the peaceful development of nations is their most profitable policy.

Assuming that all civilised nations long for Peace, if one or more of the chief Powers were to approach the others in the proper spirit, a League of Peace would seem highly probable.

There is another point of view: the world, once so unknown, with ports so distant, has now shrunk into a neighbourhood in constant and instantaneous communication, international exchanges reaching the enormous sum of £5,600,000,000 per year.

It stands to reason, therefore, that under these changed conditions no one or two nations should be permitted to disturb the world's Peace, in which other nations have a common interest and upon which they are more or less dependent. Nations are partners to-day in this world-business, and have a right to be consulted in all

SPEECH BY

matters pertaining to the world's Peace. They are rapidly becoming inter-dependent, and international courts must of necessity soon be established. We have the germ of these already in the world Marine Court recently agreed upon in London by the delegates of the eight naval Powers, Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, Italy, and the United States. This tribunal, composed of one judge from each land, is to pass final judgment upon all questions within its sphere. It is this which our Secretary of State, Mr. Knox, has wisely suggested should become an arbitral court, empowered to consider all disputes referred to it by the nations. If the Powers agree to his admirable suggestion, which stamps him as a statesman, the world will soon have a permanent International Court composed of the foremost of the world's jurists, ready to pass judgment upon any international dispute that may be submitted. Thus the world moves steadily toward Peace and brotherhood.

Peaceful arbitration has so far been the chief agent of progress toward the reign of Peace and can be credited with having already settled nearly six hundred international disputes. Secretary Root has broken all records by negotiating

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

twenty-four arbitration treaties, and for this and other important services he deserves high place among the workers for international Peace. Such treaties are not to be judged solely by their provisions. These to which we have referred are limited to certain subjects, exclusive of others, but the average citizen knows little of treaty contents, and hence the mere fact that his country has agreed with another to settle some issues peacefully, inspires friendly feelings which may some day count. Again, statesmen, knowing that their respective countries have agreed to settle some kinds of disputes peaceably, are predisposed to follow that mode for the settlement of others; therefore all treaties, whatever their limitations, make for Peace.

But arbitration of international disputes has so far encountered a serious obstacle; nations have been and still are indisposed to submit all disputes to arbitration. Although Belgium and Holland, Chile and the Argentine, Norway and Sweden have done so, one or more exceptions are always made by the chief nations, and these are fatal to the one indispensable change required—the removal of the danger of war, without which nothing vital is gained.

Many devoted disciples of Peace were seriously

SPEECH BY

studying this feature of the problem when the solution came unexpectedly in a flash of inspiration from no less a ruler than President Taft that revealed the true path to the realisation of Peace on earth. Here is the deliverance before the Peace and Arbitration Society in New York on March 22nd, 1910, which we believe will remain memorable for untold ages, and give the author rank among the immortals as one of the foremost benefactors of his race.

“Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honour should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or of national proprietorship. I know that is going farther than most men are willing to go, but I do not see why questions of honour may not be submitted to a tribunal composed of men of honour who understand questions of national honour, to abide by their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations.”

In these few words President Taft becomes among rulers the leader of the holy crusade against man killing man in war, as Lincoln became the leader in the crusade against the selling of man by man. Much to the dismay of mere party politicians Lincoln went to the root of the curse of slavery,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

declaring that a nation could not endure permanently half slave and half free. Our leader of to-day declares it is the duty of nations to refer to a court of honour all questions thought to affect their honour as well as any other questions arising between them. Thus nations cannot sit as judges in their own causes, for this would violate the first principles of natural justice, as is shown by the fact that in our day a judge known to have sat in judgment in a cause in which he was even in the smallest degree personally interested would die in infamy. So will nations sink into infamy which insist much longer upon trampling under foot this benign rule of law. Courts of honour, such as suggested by the President, are rapidly coming into favour in countries which still tolerate the duel, which our race has discarded.

The German Emperor especially is reputed to have done much to introduce these, and hence to restrict duelling.

It is quite true that the President, as he says, "goes further than most men are willing to go," otherwise he would not be a leader; for a leader's place is in the front. But—and this is another characteristic of the truly great leader—he goes no further than is absolutely necessary. Had he

SPEECH BY

exempted any one subject, even that phantom called "honour," from arbitration—although no nation can dishonour another nation, and no man ever did or ever can dishonour another man, all honour's wounds being self-inflicted—he would have failed to bridge the chasm between Peace and the danger of war, and little would have been gained. Armaments would continue to swell as at present, increasing suspicion, jealousy, and hatred between the Powers until war broke forth as the natural result of mutual preparation, which from its very nature creates what it so vainly hopes to prevent.

When the final step is taken and the representatives of the nations assemble to organise the International Court, to which they agree to submit all disputes, it may be assumed that they will specify as a fundamental principle that the independence of nations and their existing territorial rights shall be recognised and upheld as an integral part of the Organisation. Ex-President Roosevelt states this clearly in his recent Nobel Prize address at Stockholm. Hence no disputes could arise affecting either of these subjects. That the tenets of International Law shall govern the action of the tribunal is also certain to be declared. Thus would be eliminated at the start

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

the source of serious disputes affecting the honour or vital interests of nations.

Let all friends of Peace hail President Taft as our Leader, rejoicing that he has found the true solution of the problem.

The Peace Society of New York passed the following resolutions at its annual meeting in New York City on April 16th, a copy being sent to President Taft :—

“Resolved, that the Peace Society of the City of New York hails the recent inspired utterance of President Taft in favour of the submission to Arbitration of all questions of difference among nations as the final stage in the long process of educating the world in the application of reason to international affairs as pointing the way of salvation to the bankrupt statesmanship of the nations, and as giving to our President a unique position of leadership among the rulers of the earth.

“Resolved further, that this Society invokes, in support of this wise and far-sighted policy, the fundamental principles of justice—as applicable to nations as to individuals—that no one shall be a judge in his own cause, a principle essential to the reign

SPEECH BY

of law and the maintenance of Peace and order among men and nations.”

Were this Society to pass a similar vote, I am sure it would be appreciated and serve to draw our race closer together.

Dedicating the Temple of the twenty-one American Republics in Washington, last month, the President said :—“ It goes without saying that the foreign policy of the United States is for Peace among American Republics. We cannot afford to have any two or three of these quarrelling. We must not ; but Mr. Carnegie and I will never be satisfied until nineteen of us can intervene by proper means to suppress a quarrel between any other two of us.”

Gentlemen, this means a League of Peace between our Republics, to preserve the Peace and uphold the reign of law. Never has ruler gone so far before. Would we had one or more of the rulers or Governments of Europe to keep him company and make the League of Peace world wide.

You will have noticed that Mr. Roosevelt in his recent speech at Stockholm likewise advocated a Supreme Court for the world, after the pattern of the American Supreme Court, which lays down the law to the forty-six States of the Union, over-

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

ruling all other courts, and even Congress and the President. He also says : " Finally, it would be a master stroke if those Great Powers honestly bent on Peace would form a League of Peace, not only to keep the Peace between themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The ruler or statesman who brings about such a combination would earn his place in history, and be entitled to the gratitude of all mankind for all time."

Upon the eve of the recent Hague Conference I asked your late Prime Minister whether Britain would not welcome an invitation to join such a league. His reply was, " No party in Britain dare refuse." From what you have heard of our President's views you will probably infer the Republic would not be backward. There would be tremendous strength in the united action of our English-speaking race, nor would we be left without associates. Our respective Peace Societies should confer freely with a view to united action. All we English-speakers are subjects of King Shakespeare, and so are we in some degree all subjects of President Washington, whose words were, " My first wish is to see this plague of mankind—war—banished from the face of the earth."

One of the most notable recent triumphs of

SPEECH BY

Peace is the prompt and complete exposure of the fallacy that war is the nursery of heroes. How often have we been told that

“ When roll of drum and battle’s roar
Shall cease upon the earth, then no more
The heroic deed, the race of heroes in the land.”

Never was fallacy so rapidly dispelled. We all know that scarcely a day passes within the boundaries of our race in Canada, Newfoundland, America or Britain that does not reveal heroic acts in the realm of peaceful industrialism.

Let us not forget that His late Majesty was the first monarch to recognise such heroes of Peace here in Britain. He recently summoned to Balmoral, and decorated with his own hand, five of these from the Orkneys, who, after two successful attempts, at risk of their own lives, had rescued a shipwrecked crew. He has done the same for heroic miners.

It was my privilege to shake hands with those heroes upon their return to the Orkneys, and to present to them the awards of the Hero Fund, assuring them that the victories of war which involved the death of men sank into insignificance compared with their victory of Peace, saving men at the risk of their own lives. This is the difference between the hero of barbarism and the

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

hero of civilisation ; one kills or maims his fellow men, the other saves or serves them.

Barbarism, which held that there was no career for gentlemen except that of man-killing, produced only brute-courage, which in that day men shared with the brutes. Civilisation developed moral courage, which in turn led men to save or serve their fellows.

“ I never wish to see a regiment of soldiers again,” was General Grant’s reply to the Duke of Cambridge, who offered him a military review.

“ War is hell,” was the verdict of General Sherman.

What need for wonder that in our day there is a growing scarcity of army officers in both Britain and America?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, surveying the past, what have we veterans of Peace to point to as our greatest victory over war as a crime? It is the indisputable fact which cannot be gainsaid that in our time the killing of English-speaking men by English-speaking men as a means of settling international disputes has been banished for ever within the wide boundaries of our race. Never again is the world to witness the spectacle of English-speaking men destroying each other. If ever we have to protect the world’s Peace we

SPEECH BY

shall be found standing side by side in that holy mission—this is certain. It was during the crucial test which led to this, the greatest of all victories, that your lamented King Edward first appeared in the *rôle* which he lived to make his own, that of the Peacemaker. Many here will remember that President Cleveland demanded Arbitration, to which Mr. Gladstone had agreed, but which Lord Salisbury, who succeeded him, declined. The American people supported the President. Even so conservative a body as the New York Chamber of Commerce voted to do so by hundreds against a few scattered votes. The British people at first were not aware of the history of the question, but soon there began to come from across the Atlantic conciliatory indications; one morning the people rose to read a message from the most powerful of all voices which fell like grateful rain upon the parched earth. It was from one who had endeared himself to our people and had never failed to show his affection for us. It read thus, "I hope and believe that a peaceful solution will be found. (Signed) Albert Edward, Prince of Wales." The excited masses saw not only their friend, but Her Majesty, always a favourite, behind that message; the occupant of the throne, who with her own hand was reported

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

to have modified a message to Washington during the "Alabama" crisis. The Prince's prediction was soon verified, and peaceful arbitration triumphed, never again to be jeopardised. Hereafter no Government on either side of the Atlantic would dare refuse peaceful settlement of any dispute between the old and the new homes of our race. If any Government did, the people would not be slow to repeat the needed lesson that we of our race have government of the people, for the people, and by the people, and Governments are only agents.

If the original message of the Peacemaker can be found, it should be as carefully guarded as the Magna Charta, as being King Edward's first claim to the proudest of all his titles, a triumph which adds another to the many peaceful glories of the old home which has abolished private war between men, the duel; has established government by the people at home, and gives to all her colonies similar rights, which, in the words of Burke, is to make her venerated in after days.

We, the opponents of war, not only as being ruinously expensive, but as being criminally wrong, involving as it does the killing of our fellow men, cannot be denied this, the greatest triumph of

SPEECH BY

Peace in our day, the banishment of war between members of our race. What is to be the next victory? For victories there are to be. You have heard the words of our able and zealous President, and of his marvellous predecessor, and of our Secretary of State, which incite to efforts for an extension of the area of Peace beyond our race. Let us hope that there will arise in the old home successors to the great Peacemaker, and that rulers in other lands may yet appear, to follow his example. The rulers of the Republic seem at present to be pioneers; we look to you of the army of Peace here to emit no doubtful sound. It is not the enormous cost of war which will ever cause its abolition, it is its savagery that condemns it to extinction as true manhood develops.

Be of good cheer, Brothers, the good work goes steadily forward; nothing can prevent its triumph. We are apparently on the eve of a decided step forward, soon the International Judicial Court is to appear and the step from that to a League of Peace follows.

Civilised nations, as we have seen, have abolished many savage customs in obedience to the law that carries man ever upward and onward toward perfection. One savage custom still mars

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

his existence and vetoes his claim to civilisation, the killing of each other as a mode of settling their disputes. Only wild beasts are excusable for doing that, in this the twentieth century of the Christian era.

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.



To the Editor of the "Morning Post."



SIR,—In your issue of Wednesday you say :
“ If Mr. Carnegie’s idea that war is a crime be
right, then Lincoln committed a crime.” Permit
me to suggest that you here confound two different
issues.

International war, which was my theme, is one
thing ; upholding the reign of law within a
nation is another. Later on you recognise this
when you speak of the American War as being
a Civil War.

The use of force from the police upwards when
needed to uphold law and maintain order in a
nation is not only not a crime but a stern duty.
It is one of the most noteworthy triumphs of
civilisation that every man or body of men is
compelled to submit to the law, no citizen being
permitted to sit in judgment in his own cause.
What is needed to secure Peace among nations

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

is that they subject themselves to the decision of impartial courts in case of disputes with other nations, since the people of no nation can be expected to judge impartially which is right. As you say, combatants each think their own country is right ; hence neither individual nor nation should sit in judgment. It is not righteous judgment that can be expected from parties so deeply interested.

The sovereignty of nations would not be sacrificed by agreeing to submit international disputes to international tribunals. Several have done so unreservedly by treaties ; most have made treaties to submit all questions except two—honour or vital interests. Yet no one thinks their sovereignty has been impaired in the least thereby. Sovereignty being unlimited, to agree with other sovereignties to form a Joint Court with delegated powers would be an exercise of sovereignty.

If a League of Peace be formed to enforce Peace, if ever disturbed, it may be assumed that such a force would be bound by the initial agreement to recognise the independence of its members and their existing territories ; also that international law be recognised. Thus would be eliminated almost entirely the disputes covered

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

by honour or vital interests. You think that even if a League of Peace were formed "it is not clear that the use of force will be at an end." If the league is not an overpowering union of nations this would be true ; but even if it were composed only of the three Teutonic Powers (Germany, Britain and America) we need not lie awake at night in dread of the Peace being broken often or to any alarming extent, but other nations would gladly join those named.—Yours, etc.,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

May 26th.

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

To the Editor of the "Morning Post."



SIR,—I have read your interesting editorial in Saturday's issue upon my Peace views. The important point between us seems to be whether the use of *Force* to repel attack or maintain public law and order in a State is or is not war. Can the police force, for instance, be considered a warlike force, or troops maintained and held in reserve to quell riot if necessary? A few conscientious people there are, or at least used to be, known as non-resistants, who believed that if struck on one cheek they should turn the other also. We do not hear of such extremists in our Peace Societies in America. I believe the crime of war to be inherent because before nations go to war there is a preliminary stage in which one or the other can offer to submit their differences to peaceful arbitrament by an impartial tribunal, as the two branches of our English-speaking race have done for a century. If one of the contestants does this and the other declines, the crime of war lies not at the door of the Power which offers Peace but of that which rejects it. If neither offers peaceful settlement, then both have insisted upon war, involving the killing of

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

men by men, which is criminal because preventable through arbitration, and both Powers are guilty. War is also inherently criminal for the reason you state, viz., both nations will naturally believe their own country to be right, hence the judgment obtained by war is not righteous judgment. That court decides not which is right but which is strong. It is a court which prostitutes justice at the beck of power. I believe that the nation which forces its adversary to such a tribunal is criminal.

The sovereignty of nations seems to trouble you. Let me ask one question. Britain and America have agreed by treaty to submit all questions of certain character to arbitration. Is their sovereignty impaired by so doing? If not, why would submitting all disputes destroy sovereignty? Chile and Argentina have agreed to submit all questions to arbitration. They went to war, but soon abandoned the appeal to force and melted their cannon, producing therefrom a statue of Christ as the Prince of Peace, and erected it upon the highest peak of their boundary line on the Andes. It bears this inscription (I quote from memory): "Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Chilians and Argentines shall break the Peace,

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

which, at the foot of this statue of Christ, the Prince of Peace, they have sworn to maintain." Have these two nations ceased to be sovereign nations? In the opinion of all whom I have ever heard speak of this action, they have reached the very top of sovereignty and set an example to all the world.

I have much pleasure in answering your questions. First comes the case of Britain and her American Colonies. This was a domestic quarrel, Britain asserting her power to tax without representation—a power she has abandoned. The colonists resisted, claiming this was unconstitutional. In this they were supported by Britain's foremost statesmen of that day, and not one statesman of to-day holds otherwise. This contest confirms my contention that there is no possibility of successful arbitration by outside Powers *between parts of the same country*, as I pointed out in my first reply, and I beg again to call your attention to the fact that it makes all the difference whether the conflict is between different nations or between parts of the one nation. The first is international war, the other is local rebellion, with which other nations cannot wisely interfere.

Now, for your second American question.

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

You said truly that "the theory that one of the States could revoke its adhesion to the Union or secede was from time to time expressed in several of the States, but when the theory was put in practice, Lincoln, as President, held that there was no right to secede but a duty to hold the Union together." It is quite true that when the issue was made between slavery and freedom the slavery States did make that claim; but you omit the vital part. Under the Constitution all the States had agreed to obey the Supreme Court, which gives the law to States, President, and Congress; it held that the "Union was an indissoluble union of indissoluble States." The slavery States were wrong, and no portion of the Union to-day is more thankful that the Union was preserved. You say, "Let us assume then that the league of the Great Powers are parties to it. In due time one of those parties comes to think that the tribunal's justice is not perfect, and proposes to withdraw from the league. The tribunal declares it will not permit the secession, and calls upon the other States to reinforce the Army and Navy of the league. Thus a great war arises, and the evil which Mr. Carnegie and the Peace Society wish to abolish is again rampant. The crime has reappeared. Will this war

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

be, according to Mr. Carnegie, a crime or a virtue? If it is international, then the tribunal will be criminal. If it is civil, the tribunal will be doing its duty. Evidently the tribunal will decide it is a civil war." Mr. Editor, there is no limit to suppositions; but can you really suppose that the leading statesmen and jurists of the world assembled to agree upon an international union to maintain Peace could fail to fix the duration of the compact, and also the years of notice required for withdrawal thereafter. Perhaps it would be decided to make the first term twenty years, with ten years' notice of withdrawal thereafter, which would give the world a fair trial of blessed Peace. My opinion is that if ever an international League of Peace be formed it would never be dissolved until international war itself was discarded. The world, fortunately, does not travel backwards. It is ever improving: to-morrow better than to-day. It also seems reasonable to assume that the independence of the Powers, with their existing territories and international law, would all be recognised and maintained as organic elements of the world court. Judging from reliable reports of the action of the Governments, to which is this morning added Russia, we are likely to have before long a permanent judicial Court of Nations

MR. CARNEGIE AND WAR.

to which all international disputes may be submitted. The proposal of our American Secretary of State is to convert the Marine Court, already agreed upon by the eight naval Powers, into a permanent arbitral court before which the Powers may submit all disputes for judicial settlement. The means to do good deeds will make good deeds done. A great step forward, this precursor of the League of Peace, in due time, "which is comin' yet for a' that."

The non-resistant, almost, if not quite, non-existent as far as I know, but who seems to be your man of straw—you knock him down so often—reminds me of a story. Schoolmistress, to Sandy MacGregor: "Wicked boy, you struck Willie Macpherson." "He struck me first, Ma'am." "This is no excuse, Willie. You know we are taught if one strikes you on the one cheek you should turn to him the other also." "But he didn't strike me on the cheek, Ma'am, but on the nose, and I hadn't another nose to turn to him." The non-resistant is surely a negligible quantity.
—Yours, etc.,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Skibo Castle, Dornoch, May 31st.

[The leading article to which Mr. Carnegie is referring appeared in the *Morning Post* of Saturday, May 28th.]

